G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1901-02
~~191~~ .
(Mr Wilson)

File No. 53

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Alleged mismanagement of the Sri Chandrasekharaswami & the Temples at Kyalnur in the Kolar Taluk & their endowments.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES LATER REFERENCES

5½ - 01

Mysore Secretariat

Note

Subject :— Alleged mismanagement of the Chandrasekharaswami & other temples at Kyalmar in the Kolar Taluk & their endowments.

Last Reference :— Kolar Dy Comr's Letter no C 1132 dated 23rd February 1903.

Petitions having been received in 1896, 98 and 1901 from one Kyalmar Subba Rao, Adike Narayanappa, and Kyalmar Krishnamurti Rao, complaining of the misappropriation of the

produce of the Swami lands
endowed to the Sri Chandra
- Sekharaswamie and other
temples at Kyatanur in the
Kolar Taluk, they were all
referred to the Dy Commr
Kolar District for enquiry
and disposal.

2. Mr K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar
held a thorough enquiry
and submitted a detailed
memo* in English for the
Dy Comr's orders. The chief
~~facts recorded~~ facts mentioned in the memo
were that the Asst Comr
and the Amildar Mr ~~Iyengar~~ Krishnaswamy
Iyengar both inspected the
temple in January 1902 &
made enquiries in the matter
of the allegations contained
in the Complaint-petitions;
that they found the temples

of—

* Dated 17th Nov 1896
Flag A

of Chandrasekharaswami and Vijayagaswami kept in good order; the puja being regularly performed in them; & that with the exception of Krishna murti Row, one of the petitioners, few came forward with any complaint of mismanagement against the present manager Subbapati Row. The memo however further showed that the manager had not been furnishing any accounts to Government. To guard against any mismanagement in future, Mr Thomson Lyngar suggested that until Survey Settlement was introduced into the temple

temple village of Kariamahalli
regular accounts might
be obtained from the manager
Subhapati Rao and that
a regular scale of the temple
charges be fixed - The
Asst Comr further recommended
that the manager Subhapati
Rao might be retained as
manager, and that the
association of some other
Dharmadarsees with him
was unnecessary -

To that they might not fluctuate at the will of the manager

3. In forwarding a copy
of this memo, the Dy Comr
Mr Carr stated in his
letter that it was very
desirable to bring the village
of Kariamahalli under
Survey Settlement. He at
the same time reported that
he had issued orders
allowing the present manager

G.O. C 2370 dated
23rd May 102
Orig B

Manager Lakhapati Rao to continue in office if he agreed to furnish quarterly accounts as suggested by the Assistant Commr.

4. With reference to the above the Dy Commr was requested to obtain and forward a statement from the manager, as to his willingness or otherwise, to furnish regular accounts periodically of the income and expenditure out of the Inam village and also as to the introduction of Ryotwari Survey and Settlement into the village. Information was also requested as to how the present manager came to

In this office no 6 dated 1st July 1902.

to the management of the
Village -

5. The By Comm has accordingly submitted a statement from the manager, in which the latter states that the village in question, which was formerly in the enjoyment of his ancestors as Desa- - Kulakarnis Inam, was subsequently endowed by them to the temple and that- in consideration of this circumstance, the management of the village has been in the hands of the members of his family. He further states that he is willing to furnish accounts annually for the management of the temple and that he has no objection to the introduction of the Inams Settlement Act

Digitized by the Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

Exhibit C

6. As regards the introduction of Survey Settlement, the Dy Comr is of opinion that it is very necessary as it will prove as one effectual means of checking the proper management of the village, although the Manager apprehends that it may result in a loss of about Rs 30 annually to the Temple, when compared with the rates at which dry lands in the village are now leased out by the Manager and those at which they will be fixed at the Survey settlement, which will probably (it is feared by him) be lower -

7. A copy of the extract from

8.

from the Inam Register

~~which~~ has been received

along with other papers,

from which it is observed

that the Sarvamanya village

of Kariyamballi is a dwadasya

Inam village, confirmed

rent-free in 1875 by the

Inam Commissioner for

the benefit of the Chandra-

-Sekharaswami and the

Anjaneyaswami temples

at Kyatnur. Besides this

village, there are some

minor inams endowed

to the temples in the villages

of Mylasandra, Kyatnur

and Kyatnur Annaikere

they being enjoyed by the

temple servants - These

temples have no cash grants.

Henry D
(Vide Corrections)

Some of
in whose names some of these lands are
stated to be.—

8. The manager has produced

one

one year's accounts (for the year Shown); from which it is observed that the total receipts during that year were Rs 202-10-5 and the total expenditure was Rs 135-10-8, leaving a saving of Rs 66-15-9. He has produced accounts of some of the previous years also, but as regards these accounts the Asst. Comr. says that they cannot be taken as correct, as they are not supported by vouchers & there is therefore no means of checking them.

9 Now the chief points requiring orders are —

(i) Award confirming the

the present manager
Subhapalli Rao in his
appointment under the
designation of Dharmakarta
and notifying his name
in the Gazette as we have
done in several other similar
instances ;

(ii) About insisting upon
his rendering accounts
of receipts and expenditure
every month, like any other
manager duly with proper vouchers

(iii) About adopting the
scale of expenditure proposed
by the Assistant Commr

(iv) About the introduction
of Survey and settlement
into the Village of Kurimahalli
as recommended by the
Dy Commr

and (v) about approving of

of the actions taken by the Asst Commr in ~~having~~ getting the names transferred registered in the name of the temple, instead of in the names of persons in possession having as at present.

Submitted ~~sincerely~~

Ks
12/7/03

10. As regards the table (point iii) of Expenditure, the Asst Commr and K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar proposes in the 7th para of his memo that at present it may be fixed at Rs 100 per annum as noted below:-

(i) For Chandrasekharaswami temple :—

(a) Pooditura Rs 3-0-0

(b) Akhanda 2-0-0

(c) Camphor &c " — 8 — "

Total per mensem Rs 5 — 8 — " . Annually Rs 66 — " — "

ii) For Anjaneyaswami Temple: —

(a) Pavilion Rs 1 — 8 — "

(b) Archanas " — 12 — "

(c) Camphor &c " — 4 — "

Total per mensem Rs 2 — 8 — " . Annually Rs 30 — " — "

For Ugadi and other extra-ordinary occasions } Rs 4 — " — "

Total Rs 100 — " — "

The Asst. Commr. further ends that in the course of the management of the village it is found that the Inam village is capable of yielding more than Rs 100 a year on the average, the scale of expenditure may then be raised if necessary.

11. As regards minor Inams

Inams (para V), the Asst. Comr. states that two numbers viz 34 & 35 are entered in the village accounts in the names of the persons in possession thereof and not in the name of the temple as they ought to be. The Auditor, he says will be asked to get the lands entered in the accounts in the name of the temples

Submitted to the Diwan

Jrs
14/8/03

The recommendations of the D/Comr. seem to be all sound and may if it is held, be approved.

The present Manager Subbapaka Rao may be continued as sole Dharmakarta, on condition of his rendering monthly accounts, the scale

I agree — with regard to the survey settlement and the Comr. may intimate the probable effect on the revenue or income from the villages by the settlement

3.IX.03

of 14/15 may be fixed at
Rs. 10, as suggested, and
the Survey Settlement introduced
into the village as recom-
-mended

25/8/03

12497
27.8.03

Note continued :—

Orders as above were
issued in Govt. Ro. No. 982-7
Mun 7 63-1901
of 2nd Nov. 1903, and the
enquiry ordered by the Dewan
regarding the effect on the
revenue from the village
by the introduction of Settlement
into it, was made of the
Survey & Sett. Commr.
~~Superintendent~~ and that
Officer in reply reports
that the valuation of the occupied
area (88 acres 13 guntas) of
the Sarvamanyam village
of Kariyanahalli is Rs 2616.

Submitted for orders as to the
introduction of Survey
and

Rs. added in pencil for
the year Fasli 1312
Rs. 232-15-0
(11.4 fasli of above)

amd Settlement

RS
17/12/03

It will be seen that the introduction of the Survey Settlement into the village will be really beneficial to the temples

Orders are therefore solicited for the introduction of the Survey & Settlement.

25/12/03

Subd to the Dewan through the 1st Councillor

R° 31/12/03
447

31/12/03

15038
31.04

Subd to the Dewan
2/1/03

yes

6.II.04

Draft subd

Note cont'd:—

Orders as above were issued sanctioning the introduction of Survey Settlement into the village.

Govt Pro: No 24-6
53-04
dt 15th Feb: 1904.
Page 7

Kyasi Venkatramanna Rao petitioned this Office
complaining that a certain Rayat land belonging
to the Temple was purchased by him in an auction sale
for Rs 116 14-0, that the amount was remitted by him in time to the Treasury
but that the Assistant Comm.r & the Dy Comm.r
Cancelled the sale and that as the orders of the latter
Officers were not lawful, praying that the sale might
be confirmed A report having been called for, the Dy
Commissioner has submitted the records He reports that (* Papers under disposal)
Survey Settlement as ordered has not yet been effected &
that he will address the Survey Comm.r in the matter He
states that the Amildar issued orders to the effect that
Subhapathi Rao who has been appointed sole Dharmadarsi
the should not dispose of applications on his own authority,
for the cultivation of Rayat Ryuyar lands in the Village
The petitioner and another put in their Darkhasts for a Rayat
land but as certain raiyats protested against the disposal
of the land as such, the same was put up to auction & purchased
by the petitioner for Rs 116-14-0 Mr. K.R Srinivasengar, Asst Comm.r
to whom the sale records were submitted cancelled the sale as
being unauthorized & illegal on the ground that Govt had no right
to sell the land as long as the Village was under the management
of the sole Dharmadarsi Subhapathi Rao The pet.r appealed to
the Dy Comm.r against Mr. Srinivasengar's order the Dy Comm.r
rejected the appeal. He reports that as Subhapathi Rao is
rendering account to Govt & as the Village is not under Govt.
management, there is no necessity for Govt interference
Krishnamurthi Rao represents that the sale of the land
is to the greatest advantage of the Temple as the amount realized is

beneficial to the Temple. He adds that he is himself more interested in the well being of the temple as it was built & endowed by his ancestors and prays therefore that the sale may be confirmed.

Submitted
2/2/05.

Mysore Secretary's remarks:—

The decision in this case seems to depend upon the question whether the village in which the lands applied for are situated, is under the management of the Government or of that of the Dharmadarsi who is also the manager of the lands. If the former, the Amildar's action in putting up to auction the lands, for which there were two Darkhasts, was correct. If the latter, it is doubtful whether, as opined by the Assistant Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner? Mr. K. R. Sreenivasaragar / Mr. K. P. Puttannashetty the Government can interfere with such disposal of the lands as the manager may make. From the terms of Govt. Pro: No. X. 984-7 Mun: 7. 53-1901 dated 2nd November 1903, it does not appear that the Government actually took up the management of the lands. They left the

Flag X)

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note Continued.

The Dewan's Orders recorded on Page 19 of this Note, were issued in Govt Pro: No. 3553 dated 26th March 1905 directing that as the Sale of the land in question has been beneficial to the temple it should be upheld.

One Maniappa and certain other raiyats of Karaiandalli Village appealed to Government urging that the land in question was not a Bataji land but that it was in their actual occupation and holding at the time of the Sale and praying for a review of the Government Order above referred to.

The appeal petition having been referred to the Deputy Commissioner of Kolar that Officer has submitted the entire records together with

a report.

The Amildar of the Kolar Taluk in his detailed English memo May 7.
states that the Appellants had held the land during the previous years according to an agreement entered into so far back as 1890 on Kaudayam Lēmure between the Appellants and Sabhapati Rao and that this was a transaction prior to the appointment of Sabhapati Rao as sole Dharmadarasi He further states that the Appellants had raised mulberry on the lands at the time of the sale which he states they would not have done if the tenancy had lapsed. In regard to the sale being beneficial to the temple he submits that it would prejudice the confidence of the ryots in

regard to the tenancy of temple lands and that no raiyat would hereafter come forward to take up the temple lands for cultivation and recommends that the tenancy of the Appellants be confirmed to them subject to their paying the kandayam on the land.

The Assistant Commissioner agrees with the Amildar; and the Deputy Commissioner Mr. K. P. Puttanna Chetty states that as the land was in the holding of the petitioners and that as the mulberry crops were standing on the land at the time of sale he concurs in with the opinion of the Amildar and the Assistant Commissioner and accordingly recommends that the tenancy of the Appellants may be recognized and confirmed subject to them paying the assessment on the land as

Letter No. 2839/27 dt. 30.9.05 — J
(Paper under disposal)

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

fixed in the Survey and Settlement recently introduced

Submitted for orders
24/12/1905
Rs
18/10/05

The present reptt is to set aside the order passed in Govt Pro No 3553 Muz 53-1905 dated 26th March 1903

L Ananta Rama Rao
11/11/05

Subt for orders to the Dewan through the 2d/E

Rec'd 11.11.05

Were the grants now urged for the cancellation of sale brought to notice & the Govt accordingly the time for not ruling not-

13/11/05

Rec'd 15/11/05

Muz. 8A]

8

Muzrai Secretariat.	File No. of 190

Submitted

The chief point now urged by the petitioners is that the land in question was not a Bathuga land at the time when it was put up to auction by the Amildar (one A. Krishna Rao Sirsi Sirsigoor) and that it was in their actual holding at the time when the sale took place. This point was explained by the Amildar to the Assistant Commissioner in his Report no 1070 dated 19th January 1904 but for the reasons stated therein, he held that the land must have been a Bathuga land and confirmed the sale accordingly. But in the decision of the Assistant Commissioner

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

(Mr. K. R. Lakshmana Iyengar)
and the Dy. Commissioner
(Mr. Puttanna Chetty) were
based upon some other technical
grounds, and the question as
to whether the land was a Bastugi
land or not does not appear to have been
considered particularly.
But on this point there is a
difference of opinion between
the Amildar who called the
land (Mr. A. Krishnaswami
Iyengar) and the present
Amildar (Mr. Venkatappaya Pai)
who has reported upon the
review petition. The former
doubts but the latter concludes
that it was not a Bastugi
land. The Asst. Comr. Mr. Thyagaraja Iyer
submitted and the Dy. Comr. Mr.
Puttanna Chetty concur

26/11/05

MGCPB—2,500—1-8-05

Mizra[illegible]

Muzrai Secretariat. File No of 190

with the terms of the Government

Order -

Ks

Subd to the 2nd Councillor with reference to his query dated the 13th instant

CR 27/11/05

[illegible]

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

[illegible]

Rec'd 2/12/05
10115

10063
4-12-05

[illegible]

6.XII.05

Draft approved 9/12/05
Comm'r Chikmagalur

Rec'd 8/12/05

Draft approved 11/12/05.

Issue 12/12/05

MGGPB—2,500—1-8-05.

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note contd

Orders were accordingly issued in Govt Reso. no 2749 of 23d Decr 1905 and the substance thereof was communicated to the petitioners Mariappa and others

Kyalamma Krishnamoorty Rao has memorialized H H. the Maharaja on the subject and the memorial has been received in this office, under cover of the Private Secretary's memo, for submission of the papers in the case.

no. 1203/3822 of 1st March 06

Submits.

12/3/06

A separate typed Note is subd on the facts of the case

Subd to the Dewan through the 2d/s

Bhamta Sama Rao
16/3/06

Read 17.3.06.

I have nothing more to say on the subject - these must have already received my

Reno 1202/19.3.06

19/3/06

19/3/06

MGCPB—3,500—15-10-04.

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

MGCPB—3,500—15-10-04.

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

OFFICE NOTE.

File No.

SUBJECT.

Sale of a certain Batayi land belonging to the Sri Chandrasekhara swami temple at Kyalanur in the Kolar Taluk.

From

The Private Secretary to H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

Memo. No. 1928, Dated 1st March 1906, to the Secy, Gen & Rev Deptts.

Paper under disposal-

The papers called for ~~this~~ by the Private Secretary to H. H. the Maharaja are herewith submitted.

2 The right of cultivating the land, forming the subject of dispute was sold by the Amildar in the interests of the temple as there were more than one Durkhastdars therefor. The petitioner Krishnamurti Rao made the highest bid for Rs.116-14-0, the sale proceedings were set aside by the Assistant Commissioner and the Dy.

File No. of Muzrai Secretariat.

Commissioner concurred in the decission on the ground that the temple land in question was under the management of Sabhapati Rao, under Govt. Orders, and that the Amildar had no authority to interfere and sell it. Government , however, upheld the Amildar's action which resulted in a profit to the temple and further that Sabhapati Rao had been appointed merely as " sole Dharmadarsi" and as such could not dispose of the land in any way he thought proper. Thus the effect of that Order of Govt. viz, Pro. No. 3553 Mus 753-04 dated 26th March 1905 was to confirm the sale to Krishnamurthi Rao the present petitioner.

3. Subsequently upon a petition addressed to Govt. by cultivating ryots (Mariyappa & others) who were in actual possession of the land the Deputy Commissioner submitted the opinions of the Amildar and the Assistant Commissioner (in which he also concurred) stating that the land had been long in the possession of the cultivating ryots under a Karar dated

in 1890 , that they had improved it and had planted mulberry in it , and he recommended that the tenancy rights of the ryots might (not) be recognized and confirmed subject to their paying the assessment fixed by the Survey Settlement recently introduced.

4. Thereupon , it was directed in Pro.No. 2749 dated 23rd December 1905 that either the first Order of Govt. must hold good , or that the men in possession must agree to pay the purchase money realized in the auction sale.

5 The cultivating ryots have probably now offered to pay the purchase money and hence (not) the present Memorial from Krishnamurthi Rao.

6. On the merits it seems proper that the lands should be confirmed to the cultivating ryots in view to their past enjoyment and the improvements effected to the land, or condition of their paying the full amount of purchased

-16

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

money.

Submitted to the Dewan thro' the 2nd Councillor. T Muttusami Rao 16/3/06

Recd 17-3-06

MGOPB—2,500—1-8-05.

Submitted to His Highness.
as called for in PS No 1928
of 1.3.06

20.III.06

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja.

Subject.

223.06
762

Me-morial of Krishna Murti Rao regarding the sale of Batayi lands belonging to the Sri Chendra-Sekharaswami Temple at Kyalnur, Kolar Taluk.

774

DATE 27.3.06
NO. 735

Order.

~~KRW~~
26/3/06

27.III.06

~~Yours~~ Office
Put up a draft reply
to the Petn.
27/3/06

Draft Rejd
28/3/06

Issue
28/3/06

M. No. 627

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 807
dated 11th November 1896 received at the
Dewan's Office from Kyalmur Subbarao
& Adike Nanjundappa

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures,~~ to the Dy Commr
Kolar District for
disposal

By order,

Asst. Secretary.

The Bangalore, 17/11/96 1899

M.G.C.P.B.—20-6-94—1,000.

20-5-02
1087

19.5.02

C. 2370

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

Enclosers, No. one

D.

CARR, I

Deputy Co

26/5/02

Submitted for orders with reference

hs
26/5/02

L. Anantha Sami's Son Sri
Deputy Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

The Dy Commr is requested to forward the statement of Manager Sabhapati Rao as to his willingness with reference to Muzrai Secretary's official memorandum No 627 dated 17th November 1896 and as to the introduction subsequent to reference, and the of the survey mismanagement of Sarvamangala settlement into Parvanahalli Village attached to the Village. It is also desired as to how this came to be to the temple of Chandrasekhara the manager of the Village. It is also requested at Kyalasa, Kolar Taluk, copies the endowment given by his ancestors.

27.6.02.

Yes herewith copy of memo submitted by the Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Kolar Taluk,

after detailed enquiry as to allegations contained in the petitions. —

2. Under the circumstances brought to notice, it is very desirable to bring the village under Survey settlement, so that the Manager's accounts may be scrutinized.

3. Orders have been issued to allow the present Manager Sabhapati Rao, to continue in office if he agrees to furnish quarterly accounts as suggested by the Assistant Commissioner. —

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servant,

[signature]
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Memo.

On 20.11.94 Srinivasa Murthy Rao, of Idyalnur, Kolar Taluk, complained to the Muzrai Commissioner about the mismanagement of the affairs of Sanjeevanaya Karianahalli Village attached to the temples of Chandra Sekhara Swami and Anjaneya Swami at Idyalnur. This petition was referred to the Deputy Commissioner for disposal. The Deputy Commissioner forwarded the same to the Amildar for enquiry and report on 19-12-94 The Amildar, after personally inspecting the temple, reported that as the puja was being performed regularly he did not hold any further enquiry in the matter Vide his report No 17 dated 30.11.95) Again the Deputy Commissioner ordered the Amildar to enquire if the puja was performed regularly and give a detailed report (Vide order No 152 dated 31.12.95) On this the Amildar secured the presence

of the parties concerned, and after recording their statements and inspecting the village, reported that the puja was being done regularly but that the manager did not maintain a correct account and render the same to Government, that the accounts referred to by him were not quite worthy of belief as they were not supported by vouchers and that Dharmadarsee should be appointed for the efficient management of the work. (Vide report No 152 dated 26 11 97). Again the said Krishnamurti Row gave two petitions (one on 13-6-98 and the other on 5-7 98) to the Muzrai Commissioner stating that the manager of the said temples at Kyalnur is misappropriating the produce of the Inam village attached to the temple. These petitions were also forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner who referred the same to the Assistant Commissioner in charge of Muzrai work. Mr. M Krishnaiengar, Assistant Commissioner, who was then in charge of the Muzrai work issued notices to some persons and took down their

statements but did not complete the enquiry.

2 The matter was at this stage when the record came to me. Myself and the present Amildar Mr Krishnaswamiyer inspected the temple in the month of January 1902 and made enquiries in the matter of the allegations made by Krishna murti Row about the mis-management of the temple lands. As remarked by the late Amildar in his report No 27 dated 26.11.97, we found the temples kept in good condi-tion and learnt that the puja is being regularly performed in them. With the exception of Krishna murti Row, few others came forward with any complaint of mismanagement against the present manager Sabapati Rao.

3 The manager is not at present furn-ishing regularly any accounts to Government for the receipts and ex-penditure on account of the temple. The account furnished by him before the Amildar for previous yea cannot be taken as correct as they are not supported by any vouchers

and there is therefore no means of checking them. —

4 To guard against the mismanagement of the temple funds it is necessary that the Managers should furnish regular accounts of the receipts and that the scale of expenditure should also be properly settled, and regulated without being made to fluctuate at the will of the Managers.

5. The Inams assigned for the two temples of Chandrasekharaswamy and Anjaneyaswamy consist of the entire village of Kariamahalli and some minor Inams in the Villages of Mylasandra, Kyalmur and Kyalmur Amanikere. The minor Inams are in the possession and enjoyment of the temple Servants as shewn below. —

Village	S. No.	Extents A	Extents G	Assigned to	In the enjoyment of —
Mylasandra	31	5 wet	8	Chandrasekhara swamy	Archik Shamanna
— Do —	32	5 wet	8	Anjaneyaswamy temple	— Do Gopaliah
Mylasandra Amanikere	35	4 (wet)	21	Chandrasekhara swamy temple	Agasara Channa
	34	4 (wet)	23	— Do —	Hajam Papiya
Kyalmur	about	1½ acres dry		— Do —	Archik Shamanna
	Do	1/4 dry.		— Do —	Hajam Papiya
	Do	2 acres dry		Anjaneya swamy temple	Archik Gopaliah

Neither of the temples enjoys any ready money/ grant.-

6 One great difficulty in the way of exercising a proper check over the management of the Karianahalli Village is that it is unsurveyed. The first step towards the proper management of the Village will be to get it surveyed and settled. A reference will have to be made to Government or Survey Superintendent for the purpose.—

7 Pending the Survey settlement of the Village, the best arrangement that can be affected is in my opinion, to arrange to get from the manager Sabhapati Rau, regular accounts of the receipts from the Village. The manager must in the first instance, give a list of the permanent tenants in the Village with the Condition of their tenancy and the rents payable by each of them. He should also furnish particulars of the cases in which he has leased out the lands of the Village for Vara or Guttige with the terms of such lease. He will also be called upon to render accounts monthly or quarterly (which I think will suffice) of receipts and expenditure to the Taluk Office; so that

the Amildar may check them and thus exercise effectual supervision in the matter. Each item in the accounts furnished by the Manager will have to be supported by a proper Voucher. —

7 As regards the temple charges the following scale may be prescribed which the Manager should not exceed.

For Chendrasekhara Swami temples } i Padikan Rs 3 — o — o
ii akanda — Rs 2 — o — o
iii Karpuraye. Rs o — 8 — o
Total 5 — 8 — o

For Anjaneya temple. i Padikan Rs — 1 — 8 — o
ii akanda Rs : o — 12 — o
iii Karpuraye Rs : o — 4 — o
Total Rs : 2 — 8 — o

This will amount to Rs. 96 a year; — allowing Rs 4 for expenditure on Ugadi and extraordinary occasion, the total expenditure should, I think, be kept below 100 Rs for the present. If, in the course of the management of the Village, it is found — that the Inam village is capable of yielding more than 100 Rs a year on the average though scale of expenditure may then be raised, if necessary. —

8 In the above proposals it will be seen that I have recommended the

retention of the present manager Sabha-
-pathi Row. As the allegations made
against him are not satisfactorily
proved, I think it undesirable to
remove him, especially as the village
was given to the temple by his ances-
-tors and he holds the management as
an honorary distinction. To associate
some other Dharmadarsis with him
may not improve matters much, as
experience in other places shews that
Dharmadarsees often take very little
interest in the temple affairs entrusted
to them as they do not feel any sense
of individual responsibility in such
management

9 If the present manager Sabapathi
Row fails or is unwilling to abide by
the terms proposed in paras 6 and 7,
he may then be removed from the
management and some other person
appointed in his stead.

10 Of the minor Inam lands men-
-tioned in para 4, Survey numbers
35 and 34 are entered in the Village
accounts in the names of the person

in possession thereof and not in the name of the temple as they ought to be. The Amildar will be asked to get the lands entered in the accounts in the name of the temples. —

/Sd/ K.R. Srinivasaiengar
Asst Commissioner
in charge of Kolar Taluk

Copy
D C
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

MUZRAI

1901

From

To The Dy Commr
Kolar District

Dated 1st July 1902.

Despatched

Received

General No. 6

Muzrai F. No. 53-01

Enclosure No.

His letter no. C 2370
22nd May 1902 reporting
amal- the mismanagement
of Sarvamanya Kavianaba
village attached to the Temp
of Sri Chandrasekharaswa
at Kyalnur, Kolar Talu

With reference to the
above, has the honor to
request that the Dy
Commr will be so good
as to obtain and forward
to this Office, the Statement

MGCPB—11-1-1901—1500

Manager Sabhapathi
Rao as to his willingness
to undertake to furnish
regular accounts periodically
of the income & expenditure
of the revenues of the
Varavanayan village of
Varianahalli endowed
the Sri Chandrasekharaswami temple, and also
to the introduction of
Revenue Survey and Settlement
into the village. It is
not clear from the enclosure
received with the letter
under reply as to how
Subhapati Rao came to
the manager of the village.
It because the endowment
was made by his ancestors?
A detailed report on the
foregoing points is requested
at an early date

By order
Mys 25.6.02

for Dy Secy
to Govt
[illegible]

REG. No 683

1903

FROM J. C. Lovell Esq.
Deputy Commissioner Kelaniya

To
H. Amarasekara Esq.
Secretary Buddhist Committee

Dated 23rd February 1903
Despatched 2-3-03
Received
General No. C. 1132
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

Forwarding the statement of Sabhapala Kovil Manager of the Sri Chandrasekhara Swamy Temple at Kelaniya Kolam Pahalla and suggesting the introduction of Survey settlement &c

Rd
3/3/03

N.C. 1127 — Kolar Deputy Commissioner's Office, Camp Bethamangala, Dated 28th February 1903

From,

J. C. Carr Esqre

Deputy Commissioner

Kolar District

To,

C. Anantaramu Rao Esqre

Deputy Secretary to the Government

of Mysore, Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No 6 dated 1st July 1902 requesting me to obtain and forward the statement of Sabhapati Rao as to his willingness to furnish regular accounts of the income and expenditure of Sarvamanya Kariamahalli village endowed to Sricheudra-sekhara Swami temple at Kyalmur and to have the Survey Settlement introduced in the above village and also enquiring about the circumstances under which Sabhapati Rao came to be the manager of the village, I have the honor to submit herewith Sabhapati Rao's statement in the matter received with the

Kolar Amildar's report No 8 dated 21st September 1902. —

2 It will be seen from the statement that the village in question was formerly enjoyed by Sabhapati Rao ancestors as Devakula-Karnidnam and was endowed to the temple by them and that in consideration of this circumstance the managership of the village has been in the hands of members of his family Sabhapathi Rao is willing to furnish accounts annually for the management of the temple. With regard to the introduction of the Survey Settlement, Sabhapati Rao while bringing to notice that it may result in a loss of about Rs:30/- annually to the temple, has stated that he has no objection to the settlement if the Government desire it. Considering that the Survey Settlement, by defining the extent of each holding and settling the demand on it, will serve as an effectual means of checking the proper management of

the village, I think it is very necessary to introduce it into the village as early as possible

3 The necessary correspondence on dealing with the Arnold's Act of 1902 is herewith submitted for further reference and obliging return when done with. —

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

A C Cave

The Hon. Commissioner
Kolar Gold Fields

(Dft- as per Dewan's orders)

Mysore

Read:—

Petn no 807 dated 11th Nov 1896 from Kyalmur Subba Rao & others complaining that the produce of the village of Karianahalli inam endowed to the Sri Chandrasekharaswamy temple at Kyalmur in the Kolar Taluk is being misappropriated.

And—

" Correspondence ending with letter no. C 1132 dated 23rd. February 1903, from the Dy Commr., Kolar District

submitting the following report from Mr. K.R. Sreenivasiengar, Asst Comr. on the subject

~~reporting on the above~~

~~Assistt. to Commr — who —~~
~~inspected the temple, reports~~
~~after a thorough enquiry~~
~~in the matter of the allegations~~
~~of the petitioners as follows:~~

(Here copy the memo of
Mr. K.R. Sreenivasengar in
extenso. " On 20.11.94
of the temples")
order thereon No 984-7
The Dy Commr ~~dated~~ Mvr. F. 53-01.
dy 2. November 1903.

states that it is very desirable
to bring the village under
Survey Settlement so that
the manager's accounts
may be scrutinized and
that he has allowed the
present manager Sabhapathi Rao
to continue in office if he

agrees to furnish quarterly accounts as suggested by the Asst Commr. He further reports that Sabhapathi Rao's ancestors were formerly employed in the village in question as Desakulkarni inam and that it was endowed to the temple by them and that therefore the management of the temple has been in the hands of the members of the family of Sabhapathi Rao, ~~this family~~, who in his ~~deposition~~ statement has deposed that he is willing to furnish accounts

of receipts & Expenditure

& the Temple.

2. Under the foregoing

Circumstances, the Govt.

are pleased to sanction the

D/Comm's recommendation

to appoint Sabhapathy

Rao, Sole Dharmadarsi of

the Temple. A note to

this effect will separately

be issued. Sabhapathi Rao

should render regular

monthly

accounts of receipts &

Expenditure with Vouchers &c

as is done in the case of

any other Muzrai Institn"

The Scale of expenditure

proposed in ¶ 7 of M:

K. R. Srinivasan

Memo

i) For Chandrasekharaswami temple:—

(a) Padikara Rs 3-0-0
(b) Akhanda " 2-0-0
(c) Camphor &c " 0-8-0

Rs 5-8-0 or Rs 66 per annum.

ii) For Anjaneyaswami temple:—

(a) Padikara — Rs 1-8-0
(b) Akhanda — 0-12-0
(c) Camphor &c — 0-4-0

Rs 2-8-0 or Rs 30 p.a.

For Yugadi & other extraordinary occasions —— Rs 4

Rs 100 per annum

memo, and fixed at Rs 100 per annum as noted in the margin is also sanctioned

As regards minor inams, the Asstt Commr. states that Anu nos 34 & 35 are entered in the Village Accounts in the names of the persons in possession thereof & not in the name of the temple as they ought to be. The Pattas of these lands should be made in the name of the temple

3. // Next, as regards the introduction of Survey and Settlement, the

Survey & Settlement Commr.
is requested to kindly
intimate the probable
effect on the revenue or
income from the Sarvamanyam
Village of Karianahalli
endowed to the temple, by
the introduction ~~of~~ into of the Survey and
Settlement
~~Mysore~~. On receipt of this
info, final orders will
be passed on the point.
~~The Dy Comm~~
is requested to report in
the meanwhile the result
of the action taken by him
on the foregoing orders of Govt

Print

Dewan's orders)

11/9/03

11/9/03
Dy Secretary
Mines: Depts

To the Dy Commr: Kolar Dt
re ltr & enclos

Surv: & Sett Commr
" Comptroller to Govt
Rev. Commr " "

Endt. Depties

READ—

Petition No. 807, dated 11th November 1896, from Kyalnur Subba Rao and others complaining that the produce of the Inam village of Karianahalli endowed to the Sri Chandrasekhara swami temple at Kyalnur in the Kolar Taluk is being misappropriated

And—

Correspondence ending with letter No. C. 1132, dated 23rd February 1903, from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, submitting the following report from Mr. K. R. Srinivasiengar, Assistant Commissioner, on the subject:—

"On 20th November 1894, Krishnamurti Rao of Kyalnur, Kolar Taluk, complained to the Muzrai Commissioner about the mismanagement of the affairs of Sarvamanya Kariyanahalli village attached to the temples of Chandrasekharaswami and Anjaneyaswami at Kyalnur. This petition was referred to the Deputy Commissioner for disposal. The Deputy Commissioner forwarded the same to the Amildar for enquiry and report on 19th December 1894. The Amildar, after personally inspecting the temple, reported that as the puja was being performed regularly he did not hold any further enquiry in the matter. (*Vide* his Report No. 17, dated 30th November 1895.) Again, the Deputy Commissioner ordered the Amildar to enquire if the puja was performed regularly and give a detailed report./(*Vide* Order No. 152, dated 31st December 1895.) On this the Amildar secured the presence of the parties concerned and after recording their statements and inspecting the village, reported that the puja was being done regularly but that the manager did not maintain a correct account and render the same to Government, that the accounts referred to by him were not quite worthy of belief as they were not supported by vouchers and that Dharmadarsees should be appointed for the efficient management of the work. (*Vide* Report No. 152, dated 26th November 1897.) Again, the said Krishnamurti Rao gave two petitions (one on 13th June 1898, and the other on 5th July 1898) to the Muzrai Commissioner stating that the manager of the said temples at Kyalnur is misappropriating the produce of the Inam village attached to the temple. These petitions were also forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner who referred the same to the Assistant Commissioner in charge of Muzrai work. Mr. M. Krishnaiengar, Assistant Commissioner, who was then in charge of the Muzrai work, issued notices to some persons and took down their statements but did not complete the enquiry.

2. "The matter was at this stage when the record came to me. Myself and the present Amildar, Mr. Krishnaswamiengar, inspected the temple in the month of January 1902, and made enquiries in the matter of the allegations made by Krishnamurti Rao about the mismanagement of the temple lands. As remarked by the late Amildar in his Report No. 27, dated 26th November 1897, we found the temples kept in good condition and learnt that the puja is being regularly performed in them. With the exception of Krishnamurti Rao, few others came forward with any complaint of mismanagement against the present manager Sabhapati Rao.

3. "The manager is not at present furnishing regularly any accounts to Government for the receipts and expenditure on account of the temple. The account furnished by him before the Amildar for previous years cannot be taken as correct as they are not supported by any vouchers and there is therefore no means of checking them.

4. "To guard against the mismanagement of the temple funds it is necessary that the manager should furnish regular accounts of the receipts and that the scale of expenditure should also be properly settled and regulated without being made to fluctuate at the will of the manager.

5. "The Inams assigned for the two temples of Chandrasekharaswami and Anjaneyaswami consist of the entire village of Karianahalli and some minor Inams in the village of Mylasandra, Kyalnur and Kyalnur Amanikere. The minor Inams are in the possession and enjoyment of the temple servants as shown below:—

(672)

Village	Survey No.	Extent	Assigned to	In the enjoyment of
		A. g.		
Mylasandra	31	Wet 5 8	Chandrasekharaswami ...	Archak Shamanna
Do	32	Wet 5 8	Anjaneyaswami	Do Gopaliah
Do Amanikere ...	35	Wet 0 21	Chandrasekharaswami ...	Agasar Channaga
	34	Wet 0 23	Do	Hajam Papiga
Kyalnur	About	Dry 1 20	Do	Archak Shamanna
	Do	Dry 0 10	Do	Hajam Papiga
	Do	Dry 2 0	Anjaneyaswami	Archak Gopaliah

Neither of the temples enjoys any ready money grant.

6. "One great difficulty in the way of exercising a proper check over the management of the Karianahalli village is that it is unsurveyed The first step towards the proper management of the village will be to get it surveyed and settled A reference will have to be made to Government on Survey Superintendent for the purpose Pending the Survey Settlement of the village, the best arrangement that can be effected is, in my opinion, to arrange to get from the manager Sabhapati Rao, regular accounts of the receipts from the village / The manager must, in the first instance, give a list of the permanent tenants in the village with the condition of their tenancy and the rents payable by each of them He should also furnish particulars of the cases in which he has leased out the lands of the village for Vara or Guttige with the terms of such lease He will also be called upon to render accounts *monthly* or *quarterly* (which I think will suffice) of receipts and expenditure to the Taluk Office, so that the Amildar may check them and thus exercise effectual supervision in the matter Each item in the account furnished by the manager will have to be supported by a proper voucher

7 "As regards the temple charges, the following scale may be prescribed which the manager should not exceed —

For Chandrasekharaswami temple —

	Rs	a	p.
Paditara	3	0	0
Akhanda	2	0	0
Karpura, etc.	0	8	0
Total	5	8	0

For Anjaneyaswami temple —

	Rs.	a	p.
Paditara	1	8	0
Akhanda	0	12	0
Karpura, etc	0	4	0
Total ..	2	8	0

"This will amount to Rs. 96 a year./Allowing Rs. 4 for expenditure on Ugadi and extraordinary occasions, the total expenditure should, I think, be kept below Rs 100 for the present. If, in the course of the management of the village, it is found that the Inam village is capable of yielding more than Rs 100 a year on the average, the scale of expenditure may then be raised, if necessary.

8. "In the above proposals it will be seen that I have recommended the retention of the present manager Sabhapati Rao As the allegations made against him are not satisfactorily proved/I think it undesirable to remove him, especially as the village was given to the temple by his ancestors and he holds the management as an honorary distinction To associate some other Dharmadarsees with him may not improve matters much as experience in other places shows that Dharmadarsees often take very little interest in the temple affairs entrusted to them, as they do not feel any sense of individual responsibility in such management.

9. "If the present manager Sabhapati Rao fails or is unwilling to abide by the terms proposed in paras 6 and 7, he may then be removed from the management and some other person appointed in his stead.

10 "Of the minor Inam lands mentioned in para 4, Survey Nos. 35 and 34 are entered in the village accounts in the names of the persons in possession thereof and not in the name of the temple as they ought to be. The Amildar will be asked to get the lands entered in the accounts in the name of the temples. (2)

No. 984-7—Muz. F. 53-1901, dated Bangalore, 2nd November 1903.

Order thereon.—The Deputy Commissioner states that it is very desirable to bring the village under Survey Settlement so that the manager's accounts may be scrutinized, and that he has allowed the present manager Sabhapati Rao to continue in office if he agrees to furnish quarterly accounts as suggested by the Assistant Commissioner. He further reports that Sabhapati Rao's ancestors were formerly enjoying the village in question as Desakulkarni Inam and that it was endowed to the temple by them and that therefore the management of the temple has been in the hands of the

members of the family of Sabhapati Rao, who in his statement has deposed that he is willing to furnish accounts of receipts and expenditure of the temple.

2. Under the foregoing circumstances, the Government are pleased to sanction the Deputy Commissioner's recommendation to appoint Sabhapati Rao sole Dharmadarsi of the temple. A notification to this effect will separately be issued. Sabhapati Rao should render regular monthly accounts of receipts and expenditure with vouchers, etc., as is done in the case of other Muzrai/Institutions. The scale of expenditure proposed in para 7 of Mr. K. R. Srinivasiengar's memo, and fixed at Rs. 100 *per annum as noted below, is also sanctioned :—*

For Chandrasekharaswami temple :—

	Rs.	a.	p.	
Paditara	3	0	0	
Akhanda	2	0	0	
Camphor, etc.	0	8	0	
Total ...	5	8	0	or Rs. 66 per annum.

For Anjaneyaswami temple:—

	Rs.	a	p.	
Paditara	1	8	0	
Akhanda	0	12	0	
Camphor, etc.	0	4	0	
Total ..	2	8	0	or Rs. 30 per annum.

For Yugadi and other extraordinary occasions ... ... Rs. 4 per annum.

Total ... Rs. 100 per annum.

As regards minor Inams, the Assistant Commissioner states that two numbers 34 and 35 are entered in the village accounts in the names of the persons in possession thereof and not in the name of the temple as they ought to be. The pattas of these lands should be made in the name of the temple.

3. Next, as regards the introduction of Survey and Settlement, the Survey and Settlement Commissioner is requested to kindly intimate the probable effect on the revenue or income from the Sarvamanyam village of Karianahalli endowed to the temple, by the introduction into it of the Survey and Settlement. On receipt of this information, final orders will be passed on the point.

Dy. Secy., Muzrai Dept.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, returning enclosures.
The Survey and Settlement Commissioner.
The Comptroller, Mysore Government.
The Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.

Exd.— c.v.

1903-04

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 2nd November 1903

No. 984-7
Muz. F. 58-1901

Passing orders in regard to the management of the affairs of the Sri Chandrasekharaswami temple at Kyalnur in the Kolar Taluk.

SBP—17-11-03—200

MYSORE REVENUE SURVEY

No. 47] 1900/3



From Col J P Grant
Survey Commissioner
in Mysore

To H. V. Nanjundayya Esqr. M.A.
Secretary to Govt ~~The Revenue Survey~~ Gl & Rev
Mysore.

Dated } Camp Davangere
Despatched } 30th Novr 1903

Received

Enclosure No. 550.

Govt Pro. No. 984-7
Muz 53-1901
dated 2nd November 1903
Para 3.

With reference to the above has the honor to State that the valuation of the occupied area (88 acres 13 guntas) of the Sarvamanyam village of Kariyanhalli is Rs. 266

J P Grant

1/12/03

Survey Commissioner
in Mysore

Received from the Govt
Dept —
Rupees
Rs
3/12/03

Mysore.

Read —

Govt. Lr no 984-7 / Mus 753-1903 dy 2nd Nov 1903, passing orders on the affairs of the Sri Chandra Sekharaswami temple at Kyalmur in the Kolar Taluk.

And,

Docket no. 550 dy 20th Nov. 1903 from the Survey and Settlement Commr. in Mysore stating that the valuation of the occupied area (88 acres 13 Guntas) of the Sarvamanyam village of Kariyanahalli endowed to the temple is Rs 266

No. 2424-5 : F. 53-04.

Order thereon :—

8/15/2/04

The Govt. are pleased to sanction the introduction of Survey and Settlement

into the Sarvamanyam inam
village of Kannanahalli,
and the Survey and Settlement
Commr is accordingly
requested to take needful
steps in the matter in
communication with the
D/Commr of the Kolar Dt

Sd
may this be printed
Ks
Not necessary
12/2/04

Sd
12/2/04
D/Secy
Mur/Sept

Devan's order

Ks
12/2/04

To,
The Sur: & Sett Commr
in Mysore

D/Commr., Kolar Dt

Rev. Commr in Mysore

No. 3836
Mun:F5/3/4/07.
Dt 18.4.05.

శ్రీమతి సుందరశ్రీ ఆడిటింగు ఎంపిక
రవరగవర్నమెంటు ఆడిటరు గారు
యిచ్చిలాంటిదే

కోయంబత్తూరు జిల్లాలో కొన్ని కొత్త జిల్లాలు
యిరువ కోయంబత్తూరు జిల్లా
కొత్తగా ముంతిరియి-గా —
యింతాన్ని.

కొన్ని జిల్లాలు చాలా పెద్దవిగా
వున్నవని ప్రజలు ఫిర్యాదు చేయడం
వల్ల ప్రభుత్వం ఈ చర్యకు పూనుకొన్నది.
ఈ విషయమై ప్రభుత్వం 28 నోటిఫికేషన్లు
ఇచ్చింది. ఈ విషయంగా కోయం
బత్తూరు కలెక్టరు అందుబాటులో
లేరు.

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

19 —19

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
DEPUTY SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Dy
Kolar

Dated October 1904

Despatched 6th "

Received

General No. 1387
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No. One Petn & 6 Encls

Has the honor to forward herewith the Petn Regd vide 1271 (together with its enclosures) dated 28th Sept 1904 from one Kyalamma Krishnamurti Rao complaining against an alleged sale of a Bataya land belonging to the Sri Channakeshava swamy temple at Kyalamma in the Kolar Taluk.

2. He states that

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Deputy Commr
Kolar Dt.

Dated 22nd Nov 1904.

Despatched

Received

General No. 1790
Muzrai F. No. 53-07

Enclosure No. one

The accompanying petn
Regd No 1801 dy 7th Nov 1904
received from Kyalanur
Krishnamurthi Rao regarding
the sale of a batayi land
belonging to the Sri Chandra
-Sekharaswami temple
at Kyalanur, is forwarded
in contn of this Office docket
no 1887 dy 6th Oct 1904, with
a request that the Dy Commrs
report already called for may
be expedited By order

No: 1791
22-11-04.

M.G.C.P.B.—1,000-5-10-04.

Endt dy 17/11/04

19/11/04

1904.

From The Deputy Commr
Kolar District

To The Muzrai Secretary to
the Govt of Mysore

Dated 10th January 1905

Despatched 12th.

Received

General No. 3623

No. 367

Enclosure No. 2 files.

Report on the petition of
Vyshnavi Krishnamurthi Rao
regarding the sale of a Dharma
Land

yes
hs
16/1/05
see note on 1st
page order
3

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's
Office
Camp Kolar 18th January 1910

From,

K. P. Puttanna Achetty Esq.
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To,

L. Venkatachariar Esq. B.A.
Secretary to the Government
of Mysore — Judicial
Department

Sir,

With reference to your
Nos. 1387 and 1790 dated 4 October
1901 and 22nd November 1901 respectively, forwarding for report
petition of Nyalmuru Krishna-
-murti Row, regarding the sale of
a Bataji land belonging to
the Sri Chenda Sekharaswami
temple at Nyalmuru, Kolar Taluk,
I have the honor to state
as follows:—

2. The Sarvamanyam village of Karivanahalli in the Kolar Taluk was originally a Desa-Kulakarni Inam in the enjoyment of the ancestors of one Sabhapati Row and it was subsequently endowed to the temple of Sri Chendra Sekharaswami at Kyalnur, the management being in the hands of the members of the present manager Sabhapati Row.

3 In 1898 Complaints having been received about the mismanagement of the affairs of the Land Sarvamanyam village attached to the temple, the case was enquired into and it was found that the temples of Chendrasekharaswami and

Anjaneya

Anjaneya had been kept in good condition, but that the accounts furnished by the Manager Sabhapati Row were objectionable as they were not supported by vouchers. To guard against the mismanagement of the temple funds, it was suggested that the manager should furnish regular accounts, and in view to scrutinize the manager's account, the introduction of Survey Settlement into the village was advocated.

4. Government in their Proceedings No. 784-7 Jud. 7. 53-1901 dated 2nd November 1903 recognized the Manager Sabhapati Row as the sole Dharmadarsi of the temple as recommended by the Deputy Commissioner

Commissioner and called upon the Survey and Settlement Commissioner for certain information in the matter of the introduction of the Survey settlement into the village and on receipt of information from that Officer, A was ordered in Government Proceedings No- 2424-5- dated 15th February 1904 that needful steps should be taken by the Survey and Settlement Commissioner to introduce the Survey settlement into the village.

5. It will be seen from the Amildar's report No: 1070 dated 19th January 1904 (in the accompanying vernacular file) that he issued orders to the effect that applications for

for the cultivation of Bālāyi Benuje
lands in the village should not be
disposed of by the Dharmadarsi
on his own responsibility.

6. One Ramappa and the peti-
-tioner Krishna Murti Row put in
their Darakhasto for certain
Balayi land in the said village
subject to payment of assessment
as might be fixed at the Survey,
but some of the ryots protested against
the disposals of the land in question
by sale as they had held the same
on Balayi tenure as per agreement
between the Manager and them-
-selves. The land in question was
however put up to auction and
purchased by the petitioner for
Rupees 116-14-0

7. The Assistant Commissioner

Mr. K. R. Srinivasiengar to whom the sale records were submitted cancelled the sale as being unauthorized and illegal on the ground that Government had no right to sell the land as long as the village was under the management of Sabhapati Row.

8. Against this the petitioner appealed to me. I upheld the decision of the Assistant Commissioner and rejected the appeal.

9. It has to be stated that Sabhapati Row has been appointed as the sole dharmakarsi of the temple. He is reported to be rendering accounts to

to Government. Moreover the village is not under Government management. In these circumstances there appears to be no necessity for Government to interfere in the management of the village.

10 It is reported by the Assistant Commissioner that although the introduction of Survey settlement into the village of Kariamahalli was sanctioned by Government in their order No 2424-5 dated 15th February 1904 it has not yet been effected. The Survey and Settlement Commissioner will be addressed in the matter

11. The enclosures of your memos under reference are retransmitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

H Whitehead
Dept. Commissioner

Mysore

Read:—

Petn Regd no 1271 of 28th Septr 1904 from Kyalmur Krishnamurthi Rao, appealing against the orders of the Dy Commr of the Kolar District regarding the sale of a Bataya land endowed to the Sri Chandra Sekharaswami temple at Kyalmur in the Kolar Taluk.

And,

Letter no 3623/367 of 10th January 1905 from the Dy Commr Kolar Dt reporting on the above.

—a—

No 3583 Ecy 2 file
Mem. F. 53-1904

Order thereon:—

26.3.1905.

From the above it is observed that the Amildar of the Kolar Taluk issued orders to the effect that Subhapathi Rao

who has been appointed
Sole Dharmadarsi of the
Sri Chandrasekharaswami
temple at Kyalamur, should
not dispose of applications
on his own authority for
the cultivation of Batayi
in the village
Ranyar lands belonging
to the mutt; that the pet
t another put in Darkhasts
for the land now in question,
for a Batayi land but that
as certain cyots protested
against the disposal of the
land as such and that
that
reception it was put up
by the Head Asst and
auction ~~*~~ purchased by the
pet. for Rs 116-14-0
Mr K. R. Sreenivasiengar,
Asst Comm., Bahadur Dale

Record do were submitted, Cancelled the Sale as being unauthorized & illegal on the ground that Govt had no right to sell the land as long as the village was under the management of Sabhapathi Nero as Sole Dharmadarsi. In appeal, the Dy Comm confirmed the order of the Asst Comm The petrs has appealed to Govt

2. With reference to the above, ~~the Govt observe that appellants~~ the technical grounds referred to in the foregoing para, do not call for much consideration

The Dy Comm's attention is drawn to Govt Secy no 984-7 Revenue 53-1901 2nd Revision 03 which

The sale in question has been beneficial to the temple. ~~and~~ It is according and upheld by ~~the~~ order is appealed against ~~has~~ Let aside

It is clear that Subhapati Rao cannot exercise more powers than an ordinary Dharmakarta of a margai temple He cannot be authorize to dispose of the temple lands in the manner he deems fit.

Dewan order)

23/3/05

Secretary Muzrai Dept

to 18/3/05 Rs 21/3/05

To the Commr

Kolar Dist Records

Endorsement

Rs 21/3/05

No 4278 Enq 2
" 4279 Dy 22-5-05
Muz F 53-1907.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 4054 dated 1 — 5 — 1905 received at the ~~Dewan's~~ Office from Mariyappa and cerbain others of Kariyanahally Kolar Taluk, praying for the review of Govt order re the Sale of a Bahayi land belonging to the Sri Chendra Sekharaswamy temple at Kylancur, Kolar Tk is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Dy. Comrs, Kolar Dist, in Cont. of Govt. Rec. No 3553 Dy 26-3-1905 with a request that the records connected with the Case may be submitted at an early date.

The petitioners state that the land in question was not a Bahayi land but that it was in their holding The Dy Comr is requested to report on this point

By Order,

Bangalore, 8/5/05
188

16/5/05
Muzrai Secretary

12/5/05
Note in the letter.

Refer please

2/5/05

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
46574
MAJŽARAI SECRETARIAT

To
The Secretary Government
of Mysore Revenue Department
Bangalore

The humble appeal petition of Mêlu Gowda, Mariyappa and others of Kuruvanahally in the Kolar Taluk respectfully showeth —

1 That the Sarvamanyam village of Kariyanahally in the Kolar Taluk endowed to the temple of Chandrasekharaswami and Anjaneyaswami in Kyalanoor Kolar Taluk has been in the managership of Subhapathi Row for more than twenty years past

2 That the said manager has granted various lands in the village to various ryots on Kandayam tenure and the ryots have been in possession and enjoyment of such lands for a long time —

3. That the said manager has on 23rd October 1890 granted to the petitioners and some others jointly nine Kolagas and two Kallas of land called

in law (vaccam) for a kandayam of 10-1-0 on condition that (1) as [illegible] betel leaf is grown on the [illegible] there should pay the [illegible] per annum (2) that [illegible] as often the land ceases to grow betel leaf the petitioners should [illegible] irrespective of the nature of the crop grown on the land for that year, (3) that after that year the petitioners should again hold the land on kandayam tenure paying the above assessment as per deed produced herewith

4 That accordingly from Khara to Subhakrithu the petitioners grew betel leaf on the land and paid kandayam regularly after spending large sums of money to bring the land under cultivation for growing betel leaf.

5 That in the year Subhakrithu the land becoming unfit to grow betel leaf the petitioners grew sugar-cane and according to the terms of Mulchalika and Sagavali Chit (copies of which are herewith filed) paid half the produce towards the landlord's share

6. That the year Subhakrithu that is 03-04 after the petitioners had planted

and

murkay pleads and reared them for three months at a considerable cost, the land would be given up land to the surprise of the petitioners at a public meeting at the instance of the petitioners enemy Krishnamurthi how to whom it was knocked down for Rs 110.

7 That the land is not Batayi land as represented to be and the manager has not granted the land to the petitioners on Batayi tenure--

8. That the land has been and is the holding of the petitioners on Kandayam tenure for twelve years past and it does not become Batayi just because the petitioners had to pay "Waram" for one year and one year only after the land ceased to grow betel-leaf under the terms of the grant.

9. That the petitioners are prepared to any assessment that may be fixed on the land by the Survey Department

11. That under the above circumstances it is against law and equity that the land should be declared as Batayi land and the sale confirmed as such to Krishnamurthi how to the prejudice of the petitioners.

12. That for the above reasons the

petitioner-

petitioners most humbly pray that the sale may not be confirmed but set aside and that the petitioners may be allowed to retain and hold the land on Kudayam tenure in conformity with the grant made by the manager who was at the time of the grant (in 1890) the accredited agent of the government

13 That the petitioners further beg to state that as detailed survey and settlement has been introduced into the Inam Village they are prepared to pay the revised assessment that will be fixed on the land now in their possession

14 That if however the Government consider that the present sale to Krishnamurthy Row is beneficial to the temple as observed in their order no 35-53 mny. F. 53-01 dated 26/3/03 the petitioners respectively represent that there are many number of such lands which have been given out on Kudayam to ryots and in the event of all such lands being sold for the benefit of the temple the lands will not be taken up by ryots for cultivation but they will have to lie fallow

15 And that as the present confirmation of the sale by Government is against law and equity the petitioners beg under the foregoing circumstances that the Government may be pleased to reconsider their order and cancel the

able to furnish security here specified, praying that the appellant may be given such sum of money to bring the land to the condition in which it is now, for which end of him now the petitioners now pray:—

The petitioners also pray that the pending disposal of this appeal order may be issued not to disturb the appellants from their possession of land in question.

Dated 1st May 1905.

ಗಂಗಾವತಿ

ಚಿತ್ತಾಲ್ ಕಂಪ್ಯೂಟರ್ಸ್ ಕೇಂದ್ರ

23 — 10 — 90

ಪ್ರಿಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಿಗೆ,

ನಮಸ್ಕಾರ. ಚಿತ್ತಾಲ್ ಕಂಪ್ಯೂಟರ್ಸ್ ಕೇಂದ್ರವು ಗಂಗಾವತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳೆದ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕೇಂದ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಪ್ಯೂಟರ್ ಕಲಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ತೋರಿಸಿದ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಿಗೂ ನಾವು ಹೃದಯಪೂರ್ವಕ ಧನ್ಯವಾದಗಳನ್ನು ಅರ್ಪಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸಹಕಾರ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಈ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕೇಂದ್ರದಿಂದ ಸುಮಾರು ೧೨೦ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಕಂಪ್ಯೂಟರ್ ತರಬೇತಿ ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನವರು ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಮತ್ತು ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಚೇರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಸ್ವಂತವಾಗಿ ಟೈಪಿಂಗ್ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ನಮಗೆ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಸಂತೋಷದ ವಿಷಯ.

ಕಂಪ್ಯೂಟರ್ ಕಲಿಕೆಯು ಇಂದಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ತರಬೇತಿ ಪಡೆದವರು ಮತ್ತು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಕಲಿಯಲು ಬಯಸುವವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಕೇಂದ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಭೇಟಿ ನೀಡಿ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದು. ಹೊಸ ಬ್ಯಾಚ್ ನವೆಂಬರ್ ೧ರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಲಿದೆ. ಸೀಟುಗಳು ಸೀಮಿತವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮೊದಲು ಬಂದವರಿಗೆ ಆದ್ಯತೆ.

ಧನ್ಯವಾದಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ,

ಚಿತ್ತಾಲ್ ಕಂಪ್ಯೂಟರ್ಸ್ ಕೇಂದ್ರ

1905

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

The Secretary to Government
of Mysore Mungry
Department

Dated 30th September 1905.

Rcvd 2-10-05

No. 2839 enclosures
207

Forwarding on the petition
of Ramappa and others
of Kariamahalli, Kolar
Taluk praying sale of the
Dasaya land endowed to
the Temple at Hyalmur

1573

Sir
3/10/05

re note cont'd & subt'd proceedings

1/10/05

Encl. Sent with Govt. P.O.
No. 27 4905 23.12.05

Deputy Commissioners Office
Kolar District
Dated 30th September 1905

From

R. P. Puttanna Chetty Esqr
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

L. Ananthasami Rao Esqr B.A.
Secretary to the Government
of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore
Mujrai Department

Sir,

With reference to your official memo No. 4278 dated 22-5-1905 forwarding the petition of Narasappa and others of the Kariamahalli village in the Kolar Taluk praying for the review of the

the Government order anent
the sale of Batayi land
endowed to the Sri Chen-
-drasekharaswami Temple
at Kyalanad in the Kolar
Taluk and calling for
a report thereon, I have
the honor to submit here-
-with the entire Vernacular
records ending with memo
No. 187 dated 7th August 1905,
from the Assistant Comm-
-issioner in charge of
Kolar Taluk, agreeing with
the views expressed by the
Amildar, in his memo dated
7-8-05 (filed in the records)
that the land was in the
holding of the petitioners and
that

that Mudbanks crops were standing on the land at the time of sale

2 As the Amildar's enquiry referred to above, clearly explains the point at issue, I have only to express my concurrence in the opinion expressed both by him and the Assistant Commissioner and to recommend that the tenancy of the petitioners may be recognized and confirmed subject to their paying assessment on the land as fixed in the survey and settlement

recently

recently introduced.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servt

W. Mitchell

Deputy Commissioner

Md. Po Car District

(Draft as per Dewan's order)

Mysore

Read again:—

Govt. Pro no 3553
Misc. 7 53-1904

dy 26th March 1905 conveying
Bowe Kyalamur Krishnamurti Row
the sale of a Bataya land
endowed to the Sri Chandrasekhara
Swami Temple at Kyalamur
in the Kolar Taluk, ~~Bowe Kyalamur~~
~~Krishnamurti~~

And,

Petn no 4054 dy 18th May 1905
from Maruyappa & others
stating that the land in
question is not a Bataya
land but that it was in
their holding at the time of
the sale & praying for a reversal
of the Govt order read above

Also:—

Letter no 2839/207 dy 30th Sept. 1905

12

from the Dy Commr, Kolar

dt-, reporting on the

~~appeal~~ remand petition

Order thereon — No. 2749 of 23.12.05 Encl. 2 Pets.

Bataji lands cannot

be given away to the cultivators

merely because they have

been cultivating them,

nor does cultivation create

a proprietary right The

lease to Mariyappa & others

not being Registered is

inadmissable and cannot be

acted upon. The Govt direct

that ~~the~~ either their first

order read above must hold

good

or as a part of concession the lands in question might be conferred to the cultivators (the appellants) provided they agree to give the purchase money realized in the auction sale

12/12/05

Secretary

Dewan's Order)

Murzan Debt

12/12/05

To Mr Secretary Kolar Dt Records

Endt to the appellants. (Dft mailed)

[illegible]

By order

[illegible]

12/12/05

Section Officer

12/12/05

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
Bangalore 1st March 190 6

No. 1928/

8009
Qev

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is

transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja

mule
3306

of Mysore, General and Revenue Department (Br: 1), Bangalore, for submission

of papers in the case.

No. 1203 of 05-06.

By Order,

Illegible
~~For~~ *Private Secretary*
to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE
18 OCT 1906
KOLAR

To

His Highness the Maharaja
of Mysore
Mysore.

8010
Rev

The humble petition of Krista Moorthi Rao son of Kotay Ranga Rao residing at Kyalanoor Village, Kolar Taluq, in the District of Kolar.

Most beloved Sovereign:—

I beg to state that the Inam Village of Kariyanahalli in the Kolar Taluq was being enjoyed by my ancestors as Desakulakarani Inamdar for a long time. Sometime after 2 temples one of Chendrasekara Swami and another of Anjaneya Swami were erected by my ancestors at their own cost in the village of Kyalanoor and the income derived from the produce of the said Inam Village (Kariyanahalli) were left to the enjoyment of the above named temples for the proper services of Worship such as Deeparthane &c."

II On the Complaint that the temple was under mismanagement by the Hon Shareholder, it was decided

by Government that the management of the temples should be looked after turn by turn by the several shareholders of the Inam Village concerned and accordingly one Sabhapathi Rao, out of the shareholders was appointed to manage the affairs of the temples. As several complaints again arose that the said Sabhathi Rao was mismanaging the temple by misappropriating the money realised from the Inam Village, it was brought to the notice of Government. The Government after due enquiry passed final orders in their proc. No. 984-7 dated 2nd November Inam 353-1901 1903, that the temple should be taken under Government management, that the Inam lands of the said Inam Village should be surveyed, that only a fixed amount per annum should be spent on the management of the temple affairs, and the surplus credited to the Treasury, and lastly that monthly accounts relating to the Income and expenditure of the temple should be sent to the Taluq.

III Under the circumstances I darakhasted for a portion of the "Bataji" wet lands in the Inam Village of Kariyamanikkam

@ Kanjanahalli. According the Taluq
amildar after due enquiry auctioned
the lands darakhasted for by me together
with the crops raised there on on 4-11-03.
The sale stood in my name for Rs 110/-.
So as per orders of the Amildar Rs 116-14-0
including local cess was credited to
the Taluk Treasury. Later on I received
an endorsement No. 81 dated 15th June
04 from the Taluq stating that the
money remitted by me should be
taken back as the Divisional Assistant
Commissioner was not pleased to confirm
the sale on the ground that it was
not regularly held.

IV There on I appealed to the
Deputy Commissioner against the orders
of the Divisional Assistant Commissioner.
Again the Deputy Commissioner
supported the Cause of the Divisional
Officer and gave me an endorsement
No. 150 dated 1st August 04 to that
effect.

V I therefore appealed against
the orders of the above named officers
to Government enclosing the endorsements
granted by them. In the said appeal
it was finally decided that the lands
had been rightly auctioned by the
Taluq Amildar, and an endorsement
from the Inzarai Department No. 3836 of 5-3
1901 dated 18th April 05 was granted to
me to that effect.

Again

VI Again the said decision was renewed on the complaints of the ryots and the Muzarai Department again passed an order No. 2750 dated 23rd December 05 that the ryots cannot claim any possession of the lands on the mere ground of their having cultivated the lands, that it was rightly sold by the Amildar and then the lands may be given over to the ryots in case they consent to pay up the sale amount viz Rs. 116-14-0.

VII I therefore humbly beg to represent that when it has been once for all decided by Government in their proc: No. 3836 / Muzy 453 of 1901 dated 18 8/11 April 05 that the land has been rightly auctioned by the Amildar, and that the ryots cannot claim any possession of the land, I am at a loss to know how th are justified in passing a revised order No. 2750 dated 23rd December 05, "that the lands may be given over to them if they consent to pay up the sale amount the lands may be given over to them" while the amount has already been credited by me to the Treasury long long ago (i.e. 2 years back). In this connection I further begs to state that the ryots have no claim whatever in the land already auctioned in my name.

VIII In conclusion I humbly beg the Beloved Sovereign to kindly

Set aside the revised order passed by the Muzarai Department in favour of the ryots after a kind perusal of the records and protect your poor petitioner by allowing him to take possession of the land in dispute as has already been decided in his favour. The two endorsements are herein enclosed

For which act of kindness and benevolence I shall ever pray God for his Highness's long life and prosperity

I beg to remain
Most beloved Sovereign
your most obedient &
humble Servant

1.3.06

(Signed Krishnamoorthi Rao)

(Dft as per H. H's orders)

Mysore.

No. H 336 of 30.3.06.

Endorsement granted to Krishnamurti Rao of Kyalanur, Kolar Taluk, in reply to his memorial dt. 8th March 1906 addressed to H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, praying that the Govt. order of the 23d Dec. 1905 may be set aside, and the Petr. allowed to take possession of the land ~~first sold to him~~, belonging to the Sri Chandrasekharaswami temple at Kyalanur, which was first sold to him.

Petr. is informed that ~~on the merits of the case~~, the Govt. directed that the land in question should be confirmed to the cultivating

reports in view of their
past enjoyment and the
improvements effected to
the land, on condition of
their paying the full amount
of pucca purchase money.
There are now no sufficient
grounds for a reconsideration
of that order. The Memorial
of the Petrs is accordingly
rejected

By order

28/3/06

H.H's order

Ls
28/3/06 4337

Lee's Mus: Dept

Copies forwarded to the Commr
Kolar Dt, in cont. of Govt Rev:
No 2749 of 23d Dec 1905.

By order

Lee